

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. The specification has been amended to include proper headings and subheadings. Claims 1-19 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant reserves the right to pursue the subject matter of claims 1-19 in a continuing application. Claims 20-27 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 20 can be found in at least cancelled claims 12 and 28 and Figures 4 and 5 of the present application. Changes made to the claims by the current amendment are shown in the attached "Version with Markings to Show Changes Made."

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jacobs et al., U.S. 5,467,266. Claims 2 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe, U.S. 5,791,390. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watanabe and further in view of Jelic, U.S. 5,664,613. Claims 1, 4-9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guermonprez, U.S. 4,799,524 in view of Watanabe. Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guermonprez in view of Watanabe, and further in view of Leverett, U.S. 6,123,137. Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Geraud, U.S. 5,538,065. Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jacobs in view of Geraud, and further in view of Wildt, U.S. 5,392,835. Claims 1-11 and 15-19 have been cancelled, rendering these rejections moot. Applicant does not concede the correctness of these rejections.

Claims 1, 12-14 and 20-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn, U.S. 4,893,667 in view of Watanabe. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection to the extent it is maintained. Claims 1, 12-14 and 28 have been cancelled, rendering this rejection moot as to those claims. Applicant does not concede the correctness of this rejection as it relates to cancelled claims 1, 12-14 and 28.

Dunn is directed to a window covering made up of a plurality of vertically aligned blind louvers 18. Each louver 18 includes opposed planar panels 20, 22 and a generally flat transparent sheet or panel 34 that is sandwiched between the panel portions 20, 22. Panel portions 20, 22 are each provided with a series of aligned perforations 36, 38 that are arranged in rows and columns so as to provide a relatively high degree of visibility through the louvers 18.

when the louvers are in their closed position. The transparent sheet 34 may be configured to control light transmission through the perforations 36, 38.

Dunn fails to disclose or suggest the possibility of providing louvers with varying degrees of light transmission from the top to the bottom of the blind assembly. The intent of the invention disclosed by Dunn is to provide a relatively high degree of visibility through the louvers 18 in their closed position while negating convection heat losses through the louvers 18 (see the Summary of the Invention at columns 1-2 of Dunn). In fact, there is no suggestion whatsoever to provide the window blind assembly disclosed by Dunn with varying amounts of light transmission from the top to the bottom of the louvers 18, because such an alteration to the disclosure of Dunn would teach away from its purpose of providing visual perception through the window covering.

Watanabe is directed to a very different type of window covering that requires a complicated system of vertically adjustable lift rails and associated cords. Watanabe discloses middle and bottom rails 5, 9 that are vertically adjustable relative to a headrail 1. Watanabe discloses one type of fabric being secured between headrail 1 and middle rail 5, and a different type of fabric being secured between middle rail 5 and bottom rail 9. Although Watanabe may disclose infinite variability in the adjustment of the ratio of one fabrics coverage to the other fabrics coverage due to the positioning of the middle and bottom rails 5, 9, Watanabe fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of claim 20. Furthermore, there is no reasonable way to incorporate the teachings of Watanabe and the way in which it provides variations in light transmission between upper and lower sections of the shade into a window covering having vertical louvers, as disclosed by Dunn.

Specifically, Watanabe discloses blinds that are movable in a vertical direction in order to obtain any desired ratio of light transmissivity between of the upper fabric and the lower fabric. Dunn, on the other hand, discloses vertical slotted blinds that are only movable in a horizontal direction. Therefore, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious to combine the disclosure of Watanabe with the disclosure of Dunn. Furthermore, a person skilled in the art who reviews Dunn would have no motivation to combine the vertical louvers of Dunn with the system disclosed by Watanabe that requires a headrail, and a vertically adjustable middle rail and bottom rail in order to provide infinitely variable light transmission.

APR-02-03 01:14PM FROM-Merchant & Gould

6123329081

T-740 P.007/011 F-055

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of claims 20-27 in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date: 3/10/03



John J. Gresens  
Reg. No. 33,112  
JJG:JNR:PSTkaw

Serial No. 09/787,377

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADEIn the Claims

Claims 1-19 and 28 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 20-27 have been amended as follows:

20. (Twice Amended) A [window decoration] vertical slatted blind comprising vertical slats, wherein the [window decoration] blind, when brought into a condition ready for use, comprises a first face extending in a horizontal direction over substantially the full width of the [window decoration] blind and a second face extending in the horizontal direction of the [window decoration] blind the first face being located above the second face, and the second face being translucent, the first and the second face being formed by vertical slats, while to each of said slats it applies that it transmits substantially no light for a first portion of the relevant slat, said first portion forming part of the first face, and partially transmits light for a second portion of the relevant slat, said second portion forming part of the second face wherein the first face transmits substantially no incident light and the second face subdues the blind, wherein the first and the second face are formed by the vertical slats, and each of said slats transmits substantially no light for a first portion of each slat, said first portion forming part of the first face, and partially transmits light for a second portion of each slat, said second portion forming part of the second face so that the first face transmits substantially no light and the second face subdues incident light in such a manner that a person present at his workplace in an inner space provided with the [window decoration] blind can still look outside through the second face, the first face being located above the second face.

21. (Twice Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein said second portion is of perforated design.

22. (Three Times Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein said second portion is of [perforated] non-perforated design.

23. (Three Times Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein the second face extends over at least substantially the full width of the [window decoration] blind.

24. (Three Times Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein the first and second face adjoin each other.

25. (Three Times Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein the second face extends down to a lower side of the [window decoration] blind.

26. (Three Times Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein the first face extends up to an upper side of the [window decoration] blind.

27. (Three Times Amended) A [window decoration] blind according to claim 20, wherein the first and second face each have a rectangular shape.